hoped that at least its principles would be adopted, especially on the eve of a consolidation of the statutes. The measure having been introduced by a supporter of the Government should not be regarded by them as a party measure. Under the present system honourable gentlemen were sitting in the House on the principle that the voters' list was a finality, and if so there should be provision for that list being made satisfactory. He objected, however, to the exclusion from the principal provision of the Act of cases arising as to persons who were minors and those who were not subjects by birth or naturalization. Other matters of detail might be improved, but he thought that principle should be accepted.

Mr. PARDEE said that what the hon member for East Toronto objected to was a mere matter of detail, namely, as to the class of persons in regard to whom a scrutiny might be allowed; the Bill only made the voters' lists final in cases as to identity and residence. What reason was there for applying the provisions to two classes of cases and allowing the scrutiny as to others? He thought it would be far better to delay attempting such a serious change in the law, especially as this question of voters' lists had been frequently and carefully considered in the House before. As had been pointed out by one hon. member, the appeal might take place in the middle of an election contest, and those with regard to whom the appeal was made would either be deprived of their votes or the previous list would have to be used. In the latter case, many persons who should have the right of voting would be deprived of the franchise. If there were improvements to be made in the Act they should be accomplished intelligently. Such an important measure should be prepared in all its important features before the second reading, and not left to Committee of the Whole, as would be the case with this Bill. A measure of this kind could not be made right by the Committee.

Mr. HODGINS said that with but few exceptions hon. members agreed to the essential principle of the Bill, namely, the finality of the voters' lists. One objection raised was that there would be a constant revision before the County Judge, but hon members forgot that that very revision was provided for under the present Act, and the fact that it was not generally acted upon did not affect the question. By keeping up this constant revision the result would be that all concerned would arrive at such a thorough understanding of the law that this revision would not be necessary. The only difference on the score of expense was that by the Bill before the House any expense which might be incurred would be before the matter was brought to trial. The consolidation of appeals was one provision by which a great deal of expense would be avoided, and instead of the costs amounting to $2,000 or $3,000, as in the case of election trials, each appeal need only cost $20. There was no clause in the Bill which precluded the operation of the 30 days' provision in the present Voters' Lists and Election Acts. The intention of the Bill was to apply certain provisions which had operated when election cases were tried before Parliamentary Committees to the present Act. These trials under the old system had been conducted very cheaply and with little loss of time, as would be seen by a comparison of the time occupied in late election trials with that taken up under the old system. The Lincoln election case had been conclusive that the revision by the County Judge really amounted to nothing, as the whole case had to be opened up from the beginning. The measure he proposed had existed in England since 1843, and it had been practically carried by the Attorney-General of the Province of Canada in 1849, and the provisions of the present Municipal Elections Act with regard to voters' lists were in the very same direction as those he proposed, as were those of the Dominion Parliamentary Elections Act.

Mr. MOWAT remarked that the hon. member for West Elgin had wished the House to understand that the operation of the Voters' Lists Act had added enormously to the expense of the election scrutineers, but the fact was that counsel had to be employed and witnesses subpœnaed under the old Act as under the present one. If counsel charged more than before, or witnesses' fees were higher, that certainly was not the fault of the change in the law. Indeed, there was no change in the law which involved an increase of expense, and if there was an additional expense it was because candidates felt more disposed to fight out their cases or had more money at their command. The honourable gentleman had spoken as if it would be all the expense attending an appeal; but that was scarcely a fair statement when he must have known that counsel would be more likely engaged as at present, and witnesses summoned, so that the costs might amount to twenty times $20. Everybody admitted the importance and the desirability of having the voters' lists final, but the machinery provided by this Bill, while it by no means accomplished this result, would involve greater evils than it was supposed to remedy. Though some hon. gentlemen professed to agree with the principle of the Bill, no two of them agreed upon the details, and the details were of the greatest importance. It was entirely out of the question to endeavour to accomplish the end sought at this stage of the session by referring the Bill to a Committee of the House. Such a measure should only be introduced on the responsibility of the Government. There were two great difficulties which he saw in the way of the measure. One was that it would open the door to the perpetration of the greatest frauds without the chance of remedy, and the other was the cost of having a sort of a scrutiny going on in every municipality every year. The Bill did not attempt to meet these difficulties.

Mr. CAMERON said it was contrary to the usual custom to allow any hon. member to reply for the second time to the mover as the Attorney-General had just done.

The House then divided on the motion for the second reading, which was carried—Yeas, 32; Nays, 31.

YEAS.—Messrs. Barr, Bell, Boulter, Brown, Cameron, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Hodgins, Kean, Long, Macdonnell (Middlesex) Macdougall (Simcoe), McMahon, McKae, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, O'Donoghue, O'Sullivan, Paxton, Preston, Richardson, Robinson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley—32.

NAYS—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Crooks, Dawson, Deroche, Gibson, Graham, Grange, Grant, Hardy, Hargraft, Hunter, Lyon, McCraney, McLeod, Massie, Mowat, Pardee, Sexton, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—31.

Mr. LAUDER said he had paired with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. WIGLE said he had paired with Mr. Clarke (Wellington).

Mr. WILLS said he had paired with Mr. Clarke (Norfolk).

Mr. HODGINS said that the House having endorsed the principle of the Bill, he did not propose to move the Bill into Committee to night. He proposed referring it to a Select Committee, but as he had not thought of the names of hon gentlemen whom he should wish to form that Committee, he would allow the matter to stand.

Mr. CAMERON thought the hon. gentleman was bound to move the Bill into Committee of the Whole. He could then, if he wished, move for the discharge of the order and the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. If he did not do so, he (Mr. Cameron) would feel bound to move the reference of the Bill to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HODGINS said he did not intend to hand the Bill over to the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Hodgins) had a perfect right to allow the next stage of the Bill to stand in the meantime until he had decided upon the composition of the Select Committee.

Mr. LAUDER said he hoped the hon. gentleman did not intend to allow the Bill to drop.

Mr. HODGINS said he had no such intention.

BUTTER, CHEESE, AND DAIRY COMPANIES.

Mr. WILLS moved the second reading of the Bill to facilitate the formation of joint stock companies for the manufacture of butter, cheese, and other dairy products.

The motion was carried, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Special Committee composed of Messrs. Ballantyne, Deroche, Graham, Appleby, Scott, and Wills.

SHORT-HAND WRITERS IN THE COURTS.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE asked whether it was the intention of the Government, during the present session, to introduce a Bill to provide for the employment of short-hand writers in the Courts throughout the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MOWAT said provision had indeed been made by a vote of a previous session for the employment of three short hand reporters to the Courts, and a vote had been taken this session for a larger amount, so as to enable the Government to employ four